against foreign aggression. Vietnam is one, the Vietnamese nation is one. It is the United States that has, from the other shore of the Pacific, brought its expeditionary troops to South Vietnam to invade it and prevent the re-unification of Vietnam. The Vietnamese people are thus forced to struggle against U.S. aggression for national salvation."

Mr. Harriman stated the objectives of the United States Administration:

"Our objective in Vietnam can be stated succinctly and simply—to preserve the right of the South Vietnamese people to determine their own future without outside interference or coercion . . . North Vietnamese military and subversive forces have no right to be in South Vietnam."

This is the basic difference: North Vietnam does not recognize the existence of two separate Vietnams. The United States does not recognize on its part the claim of North Vietnam that the division of Vietnam is without legality. In essence, what the negotiations will decide is whether there will be in time a unified Vietnam or whether there will continue to be a divided Vietnam. The issues of de-escalation of hostilities, such international peace-keeping arrangements as may be set up and such political and economic agreements as may be made for the future will be shaped and conditioned by how the basic issue of whether there shall be one Vietnam or two Vietnams is finally resolved. Whether a settlement of the war in Vietnam will be lasting will depend upon how the United States decides to exercise its role of world leadership.

SELF-IMPOSED LIMITS

And it is upon the nature of our world leadership—our foreign policy after the Vietnamese settlement—that I would like to focus my attention. The agonizing and bitter experience of Vietnam has had disturbing effects upon the United States and people throughout the world. We have learned that having more power—more military force and economic strength—than any other nation in the world cannot of itself shape the world as we would like to have it. This inability is largely due to the principles and traditions of the kind of nation we have become—a nation that believes in the rule of law and the settlement of disputes through reason—a nation that is reluctant to use violent means except in an act of self-defense. We have discovered in Vietnam that despite all our might, our power is limited. We have discovered that the limitation of power is largely self-imposed. We have come to recognize that, unless the United States is directly threatened by an enemy whose objective is the destruction of the United States, we will not use our power in ways that would assure military victory through all-out war that would lead to the complete destruction of the enemy. Therefore, the first lesson we have learned from Vietnam is the limitation of our great power.

MORE TROOPS NEEDED?

The implications of involvement in conflicts anywhere in the world cannot be isolated to that area. The implications of action even in the most remote corners of the globe can affect our relations with other countries in serious and damaging ways. Actions taken 11,000 miles away can, as we are so painfully aware, affect the domestic affairs and tranquility of our own country. So a second lesson we have learned from Vietnam is that acts of intervention—particularly military intervention—must be considered in the light of our overall domestic and international priorities. Clearly, one effect of our tragic involvement in Vietnam has been that we have failed to consider with a balanced perspective the problems that most demand our attention. Because of Vietnam, the problems of our cities, of our minority groups, of education and health, not to mention important security alliances, have not received the attention they deserve. Of this need to reassess our national priorities we have become aware—hopefully not too late.

Of course, troubled conditions in Southeast Asia and in other regions of the world could confront the United States with new dilemmas of the kind we faced in Vietnam. Already, in Thailand and Laos and Cambodia there are serious problems of insurgency. And for the past few years, the American military presence and/or influence in these countries' affairs has grown, largely as a result of the war in Vietnam. The United States will be faced, and I believe in the very near future, with the necessity to make decisions whether to send more troops, more military equipment and more economic aid, so that these countries may meet the challenges made by insurgent groups supported by outside forces. In Thailand, for example, in 1960 after 10 years of assistance, the U.S. had only 500 advisors; in 1962, 8,000; in 1965, 25,000—we now have 47,000 men based in Thailand. It is my hope that new decisions to send additional troops will not be made without careful attention to our national priorities and with full consultation with the Congress and the full awareness of the people of the United States.

A third lesson we have learned from Vietnam is that unless the government of a nation we are trying to help has the will and capacity to meet the aspirations of its people and their demands for greater justice, no amount of military assistance to these governments will be able to achieve the goal of creating a strong and stable country. There are many responsible leaders who have maintained that our security was never importantly threatened in Vietnam, and that no matter what the outcome of the conflict between the governments of Hanoi and Saigon, American security interests would not have suffered. On the other hand, there are many who believed with the Administration and continue to believe that American security is very much involved in the outcome of the struggle in Vietnam. We are all aware of the gradual and almost imperceptible way in which the United States became more deeply involved in Vietnam. In the early stages of our involvement, United States security interests were not importantly involved. Because of the growing scale of our involvement—an involvement whose larger implications we did not conceive of—our security interests in time became an issue of overwhelming importance.

In view of the problem that such involvements as Vietnam create, the Tonkin Gulf hearings held by the Senate during the past year served a constructive purpose. What the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was attempting to do in its hearings was not to place blame; rather it attempted to discover if orderly and workable decision-making procedures could be identified and institutionalized, so that those who have the responsibility to make basic decisions concerning the security of the United States can have the time, the understanding and the full knowledge of the facts of a situation required to make a fully deliberate and rational decision as to whether involvement is in the overall interests of the United States. The need for effective decision-making procedures is the fourth lesson we have learned from Vietnam.

CREATIVE DIPLOMACY

Finally, I believe it has become clear that we have placed too much stress upon the use of military force as a means to organize the peace. It will, of course, continue to be necessary to maintain our pre-eminent military strength. In the future, there will undoubtedly be occasions when the forces of the United States will have no other recourse but to fight in order to defend its basic security interests. We must find new ways usefully to assist the creative and positive social and political forces in the emerging nations. A greater emphasis on creative diplomacy than is now the case—on international organizations, on economic assistance and on the interchange of the business, trade, technical and cultural activities of nations—would do more, in my view, to promote durable peace than a continued reliance and emphasis on military security arrangements so dominant during the past ten years. So this is a fifth lesson of Vietnam: that we must make greater efforts to use peaceful means of organizing the peace than we have in the past. We must do so without weakening our ability to defend ourselves if necessary. The two objectives are not incompatible, but the two objectives must be used with wisdom and a full understanding of the purposes and inherent capabilities of the two approaches.

The war in Vietnam has shaken the foundations. It has been a bitter experience, full of loss and tragedy, yet it offers the United States and the world a great opportunity. Because neither the United States nor its opponent has been able to impose its will through force, the nations and peoples involved have been forced to ask where we have failed and what we must do in order to succeed. I have always had confidence in the purposes of our nation, and I continue to believe these purposes are just. Our failure in Vietnam has not been one of our national integrity. Let us be grateful rather than despondent, for the harsh and bitter experience of Vietnam has given the people and leaders of the United States the opportunity to reexamine our principles, to reorder our priorities with reason and justice, and as a result, I believe we will be able to unite and strengthen our country and reestablish our position of moral leadership in the world.

EAST EUROPEAN TRADE OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the international trade concerns of the United States are many and varied. Much of the talk in Congress centers on balance-of-payments concerns and protectionist measures. I think it important that Congress this year not overlook the crucial importance of East-West trade opportunities both in the interest of a response to the events in Eastern Europe and a response to American trade difficulties.

An editorial and an article appearing in the Washington Post recently discuss the failure of the United States to respond to changes in Eastern Europe and to take advantage of increased trade opportunities. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Return to Glassboro" from the Washington Post of June 8, 1968, and an article entitled "United States Blind to Red Trade Opportunity" from the Washington Post of June 10, 1968, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 8, 1968]

RETURN TO GLASSBORO

The President's return to Glassboro, where he met with Premier Kosygin a year ago, was more than an exercise in nostalgia. It allowed him to restate his major interest in cooperation with the Soviet Union—an interest he has tried earnestly to spare from the inroads of Vietnam. One does not have to accept Mr. Johnson's self-professed "optimism" about the Soviet-American outlook in order to appreciate his efforts to improve it. Perhaps next year Glassboro could invite Mr. Kosygin to give the commencement address.

Mr. Johnson's review centered on Executive initiatives. Yet obviously, a substantial range of American policy requires a congressional

mandate and it is here that American performance has been noticeably remiss. A case in point is East-West trade. Not only has Congress sewn in restrictions, centering on Vietnam; it has refused the President selective authority to halt tariff discrimination.

So dispirited is the Administration, however, that it has not even resubmitted its request for that authority. Instead, it is standing by, albeit helpfully, while Senator Mondale tries to pilot through a "sense of Congress" resolution favoring East-West trade. The resolution has the useful but limited purpose of keeping the issue alive—chiefly by whetting appetites for prospective trading profits—until Congress's Vietnam fever subsides.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Johnson, at Glassboro, did not address himself to East Europe, particularly Czechoslovakia. The omission will tend to confirm a harmful and widespread impression that, to cooperate with the Soviet Union, the United States is refraining from support of the new liberal regime in Prague. To explain its feeble response to the Czech transformation, the Administration has gotten into the habit of pointing with a helpless shrug at Congress. It would do better to show more of an enterprising spirit toward East Europe on its own.

[From the Washington Post, June 10, 1968]

UNITED STATES BLIND TO RED TRADE OPPORTUNITY

(By Murray Seeger)

President Johnson's recent trade message to Congress was more notable for what it didn't contain than for what it did say.

On the positive side, Mr. Johnson refused to be stampeded by the heavy protectionist mood of Congress and rejected requests for new taxes on foreign imports.

But, on the negative side, he bowed to the cold political facts of today and made no new bid to loosen the chains that bind American trade relations with eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

For 20 years, the United States and the trading nations of Western Europe have been watching the Iron Curtain for the appearance of cracks big enough to accommodate commercial trading.

Those rents are now there for all to see except those members of Congress whose reaction to Communism is as automatic as the fire house dog's response to an alarm.

At first there was only Yugoslavia and Titoism. Now there is Rumania and Czechoslovakia and a new era of national Communism. Opportunities for restoring normal commercial relations between east and west are developing rapidly for those prepared for change.

But the biggest trading nation of all—the United States—is not ready. Instead of moving forward to a new era, this country is moving sideways and backward, guided by Congressmen more concerned about short range politics than long range national interests.

The attitude of Congress has been to tie the President's hands so that he cannot negotiate and deal with the Eastern bloc countries the way he would like to.

In a landmark speech on Oct. 7, 1966, Mr. Johnson said: "Our task is to achieve a reconciliation with the East—a shift from the narrow concept of coexistence to the broader vision of peaceful engagement . . . we seek healthy economic and cultural relations with the Communist states."

The record since that date has been one of erecting road administration can use their power only with Yugoslavia and Poland. Goods from other Eastern nations must enter the American market on a high tariff schedule written in 1930.

The President in 1966 extended the power of the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial credits to Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia in addition to Yugoslavia.

But early this year Congress wrote a law barring bank credits to any nation supplying goods to North Vietnam. Only Yugoslavia has passed that test.

As a result individual American businessmen seeking trade opportunities in Eastern Europe find that the countries cannot sell enough goods in this country to earn dollars and that they cannot get the kind of loan guarantees routinely given for overseas deals in other countries.

Trade between American companies and eastern Europe is growing despite the handicaps imposed by Congress. The administration is encouraging the companies to move into the newly opened markets, but the effort is risky and limited.

The businessman who does business with the curtain countries runs the risk of being attacked by such right wing groups as the Young Americans for Freedom who forced the Firestone Tire and Rubber Co. to back out of a deal in Romania and embargoed by the International Longshoremen's Assn. The YAF and ILA have little in common except a knee-jerk reaction to anything labeled communism.

Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) has moved into this subject with a resolution to put Congress on record in favor of peaceful East-West trade and a bill that would grant special tariff concessions to Czechoslovakia.

In the present mood of Congress neither item is likely to be passed. Mondale, however, has been able to air the subject through his power as a subcommittee chairman to call hearings.

The majority of Congress still sees Communism as a monolithic power directed from Moscow bent on destruction of the free world. In this Neanderthalic view, ordinary commercial trade is equated with foreign aid.

In dealing with Communist nations, according to this argument, the goods purchased from us would enable the Soviets and their allies to devote a larger portion of their economies to building war machines.

This argument is foolish—the Soviets have become a formidable world power without much trade from the West and will continue to devote the resources it chooses to maintain its strength.

In the meantime, the failure of Communist economics to satisfy the desires of the Eastern European nations becomes more apparent every day. The desire to catch up with the western consumer economies is one of the most compelling forces in the Communist nations.

The United States should be in a position to encourage these instincts and to promote the concept of nationalism which is breaking up the old satellite system. This would best serve our security interests by reducing the threat of Communist expansion in Europe, improve our trade and balance of payments accounts and provides more demands for the economy and jobs for American workers.

PRINCIPLES OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of a winning essay by a high-school student in Asheville, N.C., who won the award for the 1968 essay contest sponsored by the Asheville Civitan Club. The winning essay was written by Stanford Kent Clontz and entitled, "Principles of Good Citizenship Which Must Be Exemplified in My Life as a Youth of Today and an Adult of Tomorrow."

I found this essay particularly interesting against the background of the recent student rebellion with its apparent confusion about the meaning and value of principles and responsibility. It is very reassuring to have such a young member of the present student generation express so wisely the need for youth to uphold the intangibles of our democracy which seem to have been lost in the rebellion on the campuses. In his essay, this high-school student tells his generation that the intangibles which hold our society together begin with the principles of good citizenship which a youth must cherish if he expects to survive as an adult.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire essay be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCIPLES OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP WHICH MUST BE EXEMPLIFIED IN MY LIFE AS A YOUTH OF TODAY AND AN ADULT OF TOMORROW

(Presented to Asheville Civitan Club by Stanford Kent Clontz, Clyde A. Erwin High School, Asheville, N.C.)

An individual's most prized possessions are often the intangibles. Citizenship in the United States of America falls into this category. The colonists who established this great democracy obtained their citizenship through bloodshed. Many immigrants have later secured theirs through years of hardship and perseverance. I did nothing of this nature to earn my citizenship; it is my birthright. I have an obligation, however, to preserve this valuable heritage for my posterity. There are certain principles of good citizenship that I must observe as a youth of today and continue to cherish as an adult of tomorrow. Preeminent among these are respect for other people, appreciation of the American way of life, and personal involvement in democracy.

My high school is an excellent place for me to exercise respect for others. It is necessary for me to respect their private property, as well as the school property that belongs to all of us. I must regard their rights and privileges and obey the rules that are intended to protect them. Class discussions offer me an opportunity to show consideration for the opinions of other students. This attitude that I cultivate in high school will be demonstrated as I mature. As an adult, I shall be expected to obey our nation's laws, which are made for the protection of all Americans. There will be many times when I shall disagree with my neighbor on political issues; yet I shall be expected to respect his opinions.

Not only must I respect the rights of my fellow students, but I must also recognize and appreciate the authority of the administration and teachers. The inability of some citizens to accept authority has become one of the most serious problems of our nation. In a democracy, the acceptance of authority has to be acquired through self-discipline. Co-operation with school officials will enable me later to respect the positions of my governmental leaders, even though I reserve the right to disagree with their policies.

While I am obtaining an education at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, I must develop an appreciation of the American way of life. A person who does not appreciate the sacrifices that have been made throughout history in defense of freedom cannot possibly be a citizen with determination to carry out the tasks of the future. Each generation must struggle to preserve our democracy. This preservation is not accomplished through demonstrations and protests, but rather through understanding of and adherence to democratic processes.

An appreciation of the American way of life is of special importance today, since there are certain factions who wish to eliminate the free enterprise system, constitutional government, and many of the principles upon which our country was founded. An example of this destructive tendency is the "guaranteed income" proposal that has gained na-